

## **REMARKS**

**[0001]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 17-20, and 23-24 are presently pending. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are amended herein. Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-16 and 22-23 are cancelled herein. No new claims have been added herein.

### **Formal Request for an Interview**

**[0002]** If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

**[0003]** Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

### **Claim Amendments**

**[0004]** Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features,

and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **Claim Rejections under §103(a)**

[0005] Claims 1-24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0217166 to Dal Canto in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143819 to Han. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

## **Obviousness Rejections**

### **Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)**

[0006] Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's obviousness rejections, but in an attempt to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly distinguish the claims from the cited art. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met with regard to the amended claims.

### **Independent Claim 1**

[0007] Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite in part:

responsive to the sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service, the discovery response identifying an aggregate list of remote applications across multiple accessor modules installed on the Intranet for terminal server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer, **wherein the multiple accessor modules comprise:**

**a System Management Server (SMS) accessor,** wherein the SMS accessor sends a get application request to a System Management Server (SMS) having a domain, wherein, upon receiving the get application request, the SMS evaluates whether the remote client computer is associated with any applications deployed within the domain of the SMS;

if the remote client computer is associated with at least an application, the SMS sends a get application response to the SMS accessor, wherein the get application response identifies the associated application and the associated application installation point;

**a Directory Service Accessor (DSA),** wherein the DSA sends a get application request to a directory service, wherein the directory service, responsive to receiving the get application request, evaluates an installed application-to-user mapping to determine whether the remote client computer is associated with installed applications, wherein, upon completion of the evaluation, the directory service sends an evaluation and any respective installation point of any associated installed application to the Web service; and

**a Personal Computer (PC) accessor,** wherein the PC accessor identifies an Intranet address of the office computer assigned to a user associated with the remote client computer and sends a get resource request to directory service, wherein the get resource request indicates a corporate identity of the user, the directory service, responsive to receiving the get application request, communicates the network address of the office computer to the PC accessor.

**[0008]** Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter originally claimed in dependent claim 4. In addition, these elements incorporated have been further clarified to distinguish independent claim 1 from the cited art, namely Del Canto and Han. Support for these additional clarifying amendments can be found at least at paragraphs [0028] – [0032].

**[0009]** The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 6) the following with regard to this claim:

- «Claims 4, 10, 16, and 22»

A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the at least one application is multiple applications, respective ones of the multiple applications having been published by multiple information sources on the Intranet (paragraph 51), the multiple information sources comprising one or more of a directory service, a Systems Management Server (SMS), and an office computer associated with the user (paragraph 40).

**[0010]** Del Canto, Paragraph [0040] states:

[0040] In service provisioning system architecture 100, the "real" computing resources and the data associated with the services reside in the service centers 300. It is appreciated that a service center 300 can be a legacy enterprise data center outfitted with one or more connectors or connection service modules 310, or a special site set up specifically to support a given service, such as video conference, Internet protocol (IP) telephony, voice messaging, cable television, digital music, digital movie, e-commerce, etc. The service provisioning system architecture 100 enables the service provider to offer its services by establishing a service center 300 which connects its system to the WAN 110 via a connector 310. The connector or connection service module 310 encapsulates or wraps the existing native protocol of the corresponding service center 300 within an

appropriate remote interactive protocol. This enables the service center 300 to transmit its native commands to client devices 400. Also, connector or connection service module 310 of the service center 300 unwraps or disassembles the remote interactive protocol messages or packets containing the native commands of the client devices 400 destined for service center 300. In accordance with an embodiment of the present invention, all services offered by the service centers 300 are delivered to the client devices 400 at the direction of, and under the continuous control of, the NOC(s) 200, described herein below.

**[0011]** Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's analysis that Del Canto teaches a directory service, a System Management Server and an office computer associated with the user. Del Canto is completely silent as to these three specific accessor modules.

**[0012]** Further, Del Canto is completely silent as to the specifics presently recited in independent claim 1 with regard to the three accessor modules. Del Canto clearly does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1 as presently amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

### **Dependent Claims 2 and 5-6**

**[0013]** These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

### **Independent Claim 7**

[0014] Independent claim 7 has been amended to recite in part elements similar to those discussed previously with regard to independent claim 1. Specifically, independent claim 7 has been amended to claim the multiple accessor modules comprise a SMS accessor, a Directory Service accessor and a PC accessor. Claim 7 further claims specific features and elements with regard to these three accessor modules that are not taught or suggested by the cited art. For at least the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the combination of Del Canto and Han does not render these recited features of claim 7 obvious.

### **Dependent Claims 8 and 11-12**

[0015] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 7. As discussed above, claim 7 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

### **Independent Claim 13**

[0016] Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite in part elements similar to those discussed previously with regard to independent claim 1. Specifically, independent claim 13 has been amended to claim the multiple accessor modules comprise a SMS accessor, a Directory Service accessor and a PC accessor. Claim 13 further claims specific features and elements with regard to these three accessor modules that are not taught or suggested by the cited

art. For at least the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the combination of Del Canto and Han does not render these recited features of claim 13 obvious.

### **Dependent Claims 14 and 17-18**

[0017] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

### **Independent Claim 19**

[0018] Independent claim 19 has been amended to recite in part elements similar to those discussed previously with regard to independent claim 1. Specifically, independent claim 19 has been amended to claim the multiple accessor modules comprise a SMS accessor, a Directory Service accessor and a PC accessor. Claim 19 further claims specific features and elements with regard to these three accessor modules that are not taught by the cited art. For at least the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the combination of Del Canto and Han does not render these recited features of claim 19 obvious.

### **Dependent Claims 20 and 23-24**

[0019] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 19. As discussed above, claim 19 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally,

some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

### **Conclusion**

[0020] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/

Dated: 2008-07-15

Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; x215)

Registration No. 59090

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)